

## ALBANY.

## THE NEW-YORK CONTROLLERSHIP.

THE ASSEMBLY HAD MAKING IT ELEVATE TO BE DISCUSSED—PERPLEXITY OF THE DEMOCRATS. (FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

ALBANY, April 10.—The Assembly Committee on Cities, which agreed last night, by a vote of 5 to 4, to report adversely the bill making Controller Green's office elective, discovered this morning that the rules forbade their making any such report, and the Speaker refused to receive it. The bill was sent back to the Committee last week for the sole purpose of giving Mayor Havermayr an opportunity to be heard, and with instructions that the Committee report it back within a week, the bill meantime retaining its place on General Orders. Under these instructions the Speaker decided that the Committee had no power to take it out of General Orders by reporting it adversely. The Committee therefore had to amend their report by striking out the word "adversely."

Mr. Connelley then moved to recommit the bill, with instructions to strike out the enacting clause. The motion was lost, and the bill goes to the Committee of the Whole for discussion. The Democrats are very uneasy about this bill. They don't want to go on the record as voting against it, and yet they appear afraid to disobey the orders of Grand Sachem Kelly to kill it at all hazards.

## CURRENT TOPICS AT THE STATE CAPITAL.

PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION—APRIL 24 FIXED BY THE SENATE FOR ADJOURNMENT—WORK OF THE SESSION.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

ALBANY, April 10.—Among the bills passed by the Assembly this morning was Mr. Davis's, abolishing Canal Superintendents and putting the entire control in the hands of the Commissioners, each Commissioner having charge of his own section. The bill received 66 yeas, but its passage through the Senate is regarded as very doubtful. Mr. Day's bill restoring Tompkins-square to its original condition as a public park, also passed.

Mr. Eastman's Quick Transit bill will be moved in Committee of the Whole by Col. Spencer on Tuesday next, and will probably pass, although the members of the Railroad Committee do not entertain very friendly feelings toward the author of the bill, since they regard him as responsible, in a great measure, for the edum that has been cast upon the Committee by a portion of the public press.

The Senate this morning passed the Beach Pneumatic Broadway Underground Quick Transit bill, and ordered to a third reading the supplemental bill fixing the time for constructing the Gilbert Elevated Railroad.

A resolution was unanimously adopted designating the 24th of April as the day for a final adjournment of the Legislature. No one expects to be able to adjourn on that date, but each party is anxious to make a little capital by appearing to favor an early adjournment, and so every Senator voted for the resolution. The prevailing opinion is that an adjournment *à la die canaille* will not take place before the 1st of May, although a strong effort is being made by the Republican leaders in both houses to adjourn as soon as possible after the passage of the Supply and Appropriation bills, regardless of all other bills that may be left unacted upon. The interests of the "party" they say demand this.

The number of bills introduced in both Houses is about one fourth less than last year, and there have been no adverse reports from Committees than usual. Up to noon to-day there had been 147 bills in all signed by the Governor and filed in the office of the Secretary of State. The number up to the same date last year was 198.

Both Houses will hold a session to-morrow for the consideration of bills of a local character in Committee of the Whole. No session of the Assembly will be held on Monday evening on account of the funeral of Mr. Knapp.

LATE.—Both Houses met to-night, without a quorum of members either. In the Senate there were fifty. Bills on the General Orders of an unimportant character were taken up. In the House the bill to allow the Forty-second and Grand-st. Ferry Railroad Company to extend its tracks was progressed.

## DEATH OF ASSEMBLYMAN KNAPP.

## ANNOUNCEMENT IN THE LEGISLATURE—EULOGIES BY SPEAKER HUSTED AND OTHERS.

ALBANY, April 10.—At the opening of the Assembly this morning Speaker Husted announced the death, at his residence in Haverstraw, last evening, of William R. Knapp, member of the Assembly from Rockland County. Mr. Knapp was in his last week, and very few were aware of his illness until his death was announced. He has twice represented his district in the Assembly, the first time in 1861, and though he seldom took part in debate, he was regarded as one of the most useful members of the House, a man of strict integrity, and highly respected by his fellow-members. Resolutions of condolence to his memory were offered by Mr. Wright of Westchester, and kind eulogies were pronounced by Messrs. Wright, C. S. Spencer, Blumenthal, and Speaker Husted, and a committee was appointed to attend the funeral on Monday.

## LATE.—Mr. Wright, from the Committee appointed to draft resolutions, reported as follows:

Whereas, This House has just received with profound grief the sad intelligence of the death of William R. Knapp, a member of this Assembly, the Hon. Wm. R. Knapp of Rockland, Resolved, That by the decease of this honored associate the members of this Assembly have lost an able and valued friend, who, during his short career in this House, endeavored himself to be by many acts of kindness and courtesy to his colleagues, and whose State will miss one of its most earnest, devoted, and conscientious members.

Resolved, That, as a proper tribute of respect to the memory of the deceased, this House do unanimously adopt, and the Speaker appointed, as the committee proposed in the same, Messrs. Beebe, Wright, Dennison, Caldwell, and C. B. Wood.

## A LOCAL TRIBUTE.

A meeting of the Local and Traders' Exchange was held yesterday afternoon at their rooms, at Murray and Church-sts., William Otis Moore, vice-President, in the chair. The death of Assemblyman Knapp, who was for many years a member of the Mechanics' and Traders' Exchange, being one of the Board of Trustees, was announced. A committee, consisting of the Chairman and Messrs. John C. Wandell, Gustavus Isaacs, and George E. Myers, was appointed to draw up resolutions of condolence to the family of the deceased, and to make arrangements to attend his funeral.

## DR. SWINBURNE'S PLEA.

HIS REASONS WHY THE STATE SHOULD GRANT HIS CLAIMS—COMPARISONS WITH THE PERQUISITES AND REMUNERATIONS OF OTHER HEALTH OFFICERS.

ALBANY, April 10.—In the Senate this evening President Robinson presented the following memorial, which was ordered printed and referred to the Finance Committee:

To the Honorable the Legislature of the State of New York: The State of New York has for many years been the scene of a great and noble work, and it is the duty of the State to provide for the health of its people. The health of the people is the foundation of the State's prosperity, and it is the duty of the State to provide for the health of its people. The health of the people is the foundation of the State's prosperity, and it is the duty of the State to provide for the health of its people.

Some inconsiderate persons are getting up petitions to the President to veto the Currency Bill. The President should not be troubled by such petitions. The President should not be troubled by such petitions. The President should not be troubled by such petitions.

WASHINGTON, April 10.—The Senate in Executive session today confirmed the following nominations:

Benjamin F. Avery of California to be United States Marshal for the District of California; and to be United States Marshal for the District of California; and to be United States Marshal for the District of California.

All the express messengers and agents on South-Western railroads are now armed and protected by a guard at the expense of the different companies. They intend to make it hot work to rob railroads after this.

## XLIII CONGRESS—1ST SESSION.

## REGULAR REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.

## DEBATE.

## THE DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

## ROAD BILL STILL TENDING—MORE VOTING ON THE CURRENCY BILL IN THE HOUSE.

## SENATE.—W. W. WOOD, April 10, 1874.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio) presented number of petitions from citizens of Ohio asking that a specific duty be imposed on the State, instead of ad valorem duty. He referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Conn.) from the Committee on Commerce, reported adversely on the petitions of citizens of Indiana and Kentucky asking for the passage of a law compelling bridges over the Ohio River to be constructed with a 100 feet pivot draw.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

Mr. SARGENT (Rep., Cal.) said it was no use to print documents when Senators could not distribute them without incurring an enormous expense for postage.

gentleman's ears had been as acute as they are long, he would have understood me. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

Mr. COX.—The gentleman ought to have long ears, for he is the organ of this Administration.

## COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

## LETTER FROM PROF. JAMES LORIMER.

## LIMITS WITHIN WHICH ARBITRATION IS POSSIBLE.

## IN 1865 A LETTER WAS PUBLISHED IN THE TRIBUNE.

## FROM MR. THOMAS BALCH, RECOMMENDING THAT THE ALABAMA CLAIMS BE REFERRED TO A COURT OF ARBITRATION.

## BEFORE WHICH THE CLAIMS SHOULD BE PRESENTED.

PROVED AND ARGUED. MR. JAMES LORIMER, PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC LAW AND OF THE LAW OF NATIONS, IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, ON THE 10TH OF FEBRUARY, 1874, WROTE TO MR. BALCH AS FOLLOWS, "IN REGARD TO THIS LETTER:

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which the threatened war between us and Great Britain was averted."